DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 514 CG 012 181

AUTHOR Fisher, Alan T.
TITLE Adaptive Behavior in Non-Biased Assessment: Effects on Special Education.
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 28p.; Revised version of paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (San Francisco, California, August 26-30, 1977). Table 4 may not reproduce well

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academically Handicapped; Adjustment (to Environment); *Black Youth; Educable Mentally Handicapped; Elementary Secondary Education; *Labeling (of Persons); *Mental Retardation; *Mexican Americans; *Minority Group Children; Psychometrics; Research Projects; *Special Education
IDENTIFIERS *Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of a study to investigate the effects of including an assessment of adaptive behavior, the Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children (ABIC), in classifying students. Children in this study were either referred for or currently receiving special education services in a tri-ethnic district of 40,000 students. Three approaches to classification of "mental retardation" were compared, based on a small number of students from the three racial and ethnic groups (Anglo, Black and Mexican-American) and from middle and low socio-economic status (S.E.S.) backgrounds. Results indicate that the pluralistic approach (a combination of psychometric assessment and adaptive behavior) results in the smallest number of students being labeled mentally retarded. This was reflected primarily in re-classification of low S.E.S. Mexican-American students at the educable mentally retarded range. Implications for re-classifying these students are discussed, and modification of existing categorical classification systems is recommended. (Author)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED150514

# ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR IN NON-BIASED ASSESSMENT: EFFECTS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION*

Alan T. Fisher
Corpus Christi Independent School District

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alan T. Fisher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CG012181

* This is a revised version of the paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, in San Francisco, August, 1977.

# ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR IN NON-BIASED ASSESSMENT: EFFECTS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION[1]

Alan T. Fisher

The broadening of traditional concepts of assessment and assessment batteries to include measures of adaptive behavior is a current topic in professional literature, in national and state legislation, and recently in litigation. Professional issues concerning traditional assessment versus pluralistic assessment have been voiced for several years (Oakland, 1973; Mercer, 1973). At the national level, Public Law 94-142 mandates non-discriminatory assessment. Similarly, California and Texas have enacted state legislation and educational policy requiring the inclusion of adaptive behavior measurements in the assessment of mental retardation (California Senate Bill No. 23, 19731; Texas Bulletin No. 711, 1973).

One of the earlier definitions of adaptive behavior provided by Heber (1961, p. 61), includes two major factors: 1) The degree to which the individual is able to function and maintain himself independently. 2) The degree to which he meets satisfactorily the culturally imposed demands of personal and social responsibility. In short, adaptive behavior reflects a person's competence in meeting independence needs and social demands of his or her environment.

Adaptive behavior in non-school environments has not traditionally been one of the criteria for the assessment of mental retardation, although the concept of adaptive behavior has many historical antecedents. Pioneers in the field of mental retardation such as Itard and

[1]Paper presesented at the Annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August, 1977.

Haslam spoke in terms of social-competencies, adaptability to environment and social norms. (Horton, 1966). In the 1960's, the American Association of Mental Deficiency (AAMD) began to consider adaptive behavior in the determination of mental retardation. At that time the AAMD recommended the use of the Vineland Scale (Doll, 1953) as a means of measuring adaptive behavior until publication of the AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale in 1969. (AAMD, 1969). More recently, Jane Mercer and June Lewis have developed experimental editions of the System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (SOMPA) (Mercer & Lewis, 1975). Included in the SOMPA is the Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children (ABIC).

As mentioned previously, the assessment of adaptive behavior is a new requirement in at least two states (Texas and California). The purpose of including adaptive behavior is to broaden the scope of assessment, particularly of mental retardation, to include parent information. Research conducted by Mercer (1973; 1974) suggests that fewer students, especially minority students, would be classified as mentally retarded if traditional assessment batteries were modified to include her Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children (ABIC).

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of including an assessment of adaptive behavior, the ABIC (Mercer, 1975), in determining or reviewing the classification of students referred for or currently receiving special education services. Three approaches leading to the classification of "mental retardation" are compared, based on a small number of students from three racial ethnic groups

(Anglo, Black and Mexican-American) from middle and low socio-economic status (S.E.S) backgrounds.

## METHOD

Forty-six middle and low S.E.S. Anglo, Mexican-American, and Black students who were referred for three-year re-evaluation and initial evaluation were included in this study. The grade placement of these students ranged from elementary through senior-high school in a district of approximately 40,000 students.[1] These students were selected on the basis of the school districts's existing appraisal procedures. Of the students referred, 119 were determined to have I.Q's of 70 (i.e. minus two standard deviations) or lower. District appraisal procedures require further evaluation, assessing adaptive behavior, for any student scoring two or more standard deviations below the mean on an I.Q. instrument. Of the 119 students with I.Q.'s of 70 or below, 73 appeared severely retarded. These students were evaluated with Stanford-Binet Intelligence Tests (Terman, 1960) and the AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale (AAMD, 1969).[2] The remaining 46 students were evaluated with the Wechsler Intelligence Test for Children (Wechsler, 1949), Wide Range Achievement Test (Jastak, 1965), the Reading Comprehension subtest of the Peabody Individual Achievement Test (Dunn, 1970), Bender-Gestalt Test of Visual Motor Skills (Bender, 1946), and the Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children (Mercer, 1975).[3] These 46 students constitute the sample for the present study.

Of these 46 students, there were 12 Anglos, 30 Mexican-Americans, and four Blacks. The socio-economic status was determined by utilizing the sociocultural modalities portion of the SOMPA (Mercer, 1975). This

essentially reflects the occupation of the head of the household and the family's chief source of income. This S.E.S scale ranges from a rating of 0 through 12, and in the present study a score of 6 or below indicated low S.E.S. (N=40) and a score of 7 and above indicated middle S.E.S. (N=6).

For the purposes of this study, three approaches were used to classify a student Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR), Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR), or Non-Retarded (N-MR). This provides an opportunity to examine how students are classified when merely a full scale I.Q. is used as the sole criterion (i.e. an I.Q. two standard deviations below the mean) for classification as mentally retarded (or not retarded). The second approach (psychometric approach) for classifying students mentally retarded makes use of the criteria utilized by the school district psychological services department. Essentially, this approach involves multiple criteria and multiple tests (as described previously) to be used to reach a classification of retardation.

These criteria are as follows:[4]

1. Full Scale I.Q. less than 70
2. Verbal and Performance I.Q.'s below a score of 75
3. Subtest pattern includes not more than two scale scores of 8 (or higher).
4. Achievement scale scores below 80
5. Performance on visual-motor test at least two standard deviations below the mean.

To meet these criteria a student must function within the mentally retarded range on verbal, non-verbal, visual-motor and achievement tasks. The third approach that may lead to classification as mentally retarded is the pluralistic approach, which includes the traditional psychometrics and the ABIC (Mercer, 1975). Two or three (EMR and TMR, respectively) standard deviations below the mean on the ABIC were used as determining factors for classification in the pluralistic approach.

Descriptive data in terms of frequency counts and percentages were calculated for 46 students representing three ethnic and two S.E.S. groups. Differences in the frequency of students classified as educable mentally retarded (EMR), trainable mentally retarded (TMR), and non-mentally retarded (N-MR) were determined, using the full scale I.Q. approach, the psychometric approach, and the pluralistic approach.

## RESULTS

Differences in classifications of retardation and/or non-retardation do occur among the three approaches (full scale I.Q., psychometric approach, and pluralistic approach) (Table 1).

---

Put Table 1 about here

---

### Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR)

Table 1 shows that the full scale I.Q. approach led to classification as EMR of 34 (75%) of the total 46 students. The psychometric approach led to 28 (60%) EMR classifications and the pluralistic approach led to 12 (26%) EMR classification. Hence, the pluralistic approach decreased the number of students classified as EMR two to three times as compared

to the other two approaches.

Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR)

Smaller differences among the three approaches were found for the TMR classifications. The full scale I.Q. approach classified 12 (26%) of the students TMR. In contrast, the psychometric approach led to 6 (13%) classified as TMR, and the pluralistic approach resulted in 4 (8%) TMR. The pluralistic approach again resulted in classification of the fewest number of students. In the TMR categroy, only small differenences occur between the psychometric and pluralistic approahces.

Non-Mentally Retarded (N-MR)

Differences occur among the three approaches in terms of the number of students not considered mentally retarded. The full scale I.Q. method classified all students in the sample mentally retarded.[5] The psychometric method resulted in 12 (26%) of the students not being classified mentally retarded, in contrast to the pluralistic method which resulted in 30 (65%) of the students not being classified mentally retarded. Hence, the pluralistic approach failed to classify over twice the number of students mentally retarded as did the psychometric approach.

Classifications Resulting from Three Approaches for Three Ethnic Groups

Several sizeable differences in classification as mentally retarded or not mentally retarded, resulting from the three approaches for Anglos, Mexican-Americans, and Blacks, are reflected in Table 2.

Put Table 2 about here

Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) in Three Ethnic Groups

The majority of differences occur in the EMR Mexican-American category. The full scale I.Q. approach and the psychometric approach classify approximately the same number [full scale I.Q. N=21 (70%), psychometric N=19 (63%)] of the thirty Mexican-American students as EMR. In contrast, the pluralistic approach classifies as EMR 9 (30%) or about one-half as many when compared to the other approaches. Smaller differences, but a trend in the same direction, are reflected for EMR - Anglo classification. The full scale I.Q. approach results in 10 (83%) of the 12 Anglo students being classified EMR, as compared to 6 (50%) by the psychometric approach and 3 (25%) by the pluralistic approach. The small number of Blacks involved in this study prevents meaningful interpretation of the data in that categroy.

Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR) in Three Ethnic Groups

Again, smaller differences occur among the three approaches in classifying students as TMR. In terms of the Mexican-American, the full scale I.Q. approach classified 9 (30%) students TMR. The psychometric approach and the pluralistic approach resulted in about one-half N=4 (13%) as many students being classified TMR. Little or no differences among the three approaches are revealed in the Anglo and/or Black classifications.

Non-Mentally Retarded (N-MR) in Three Ethnic Groups

The psychometric and pluralistic approaches resulted in different numbers of students being termed non-mentally retarded (N-MR). The pluralistic approach resulted in 17 (57%) Mexican-American students being termed N-MR (or approximately twice as many) as compared to the psychometric approach which termed 7 (23%) N-MR. A similar trend is reflected in the Anglo and Black populations. In the Anglo sub-group, the pluralistic approach led to approximately twice (9-75%) as many students not being classified mentally retarded (N-MR) as did the psychometric approach which showed 5 (42%) Anglo students to be not mentally retarded. Again, the small number of Blacks prevents interpretation of the data.

Classification Resulting from Three Approaches for Two S.E.S. Groups

Table 3 suggests that differences do occur among the three approaches according to S.E.S.

---

Put Table 3 about here

---

Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) In Two S.E.S. Groups

The three approaches differed very little for middle S.E.S. (N=6) [(full scale I.Q. N=3 (50%), psychometric N=2 (33%), and pluralistic N=2 (33%)] at the EMR level of classification. However, the limited number of middle S.E.S. students prevents any conclusions based on present data. In contrast, rather large differences occur in the three approaches for the forty low S.E.S. students. The full scale I.Q. approach resulted in 31 (78%) of the low S.E.S. students being classified EMR as compared to 25 (63%) by the psychometric approach and 10 (25%)

by the pluralistic approach. Hence, the pluralistic approach resulted in about one-half as many low S.E.S. students being classified EMR as compared to the psychometric approach, and approximately one-third as many being classified EMR as compared to the full scale I.Q. approach.

Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR) in Two S.E.S. Groups

Very few middle S.E.S. students were classified as trainable mentally retarded by any of the three approaches [full scale I.Q. N=2 (25%), psychometric N=1 (17%), and pluralistic N=1 (17%)]. Similar findings were revealed for EMR classifications with middle S.E.S. students. Again, the limited number of middle S.E.S. students in this study prevents any interpretation of this data. However, larger differences do occur in the classification of low S.E.S. students as TMR. The full scale I.Q. approach resulted in 10 (25%) of the S.E.S. students being classified TMR. The psychometric approach led to 5 (13%), and the pluralistic approach led to 3 (8%) of the low S.E.S. students being classified TMR. The pluralistic approach classified approximately one-half as many students TMR as did the psychometric approach. Again, the pluralistic approach classified approximately one-third as many students TMR as did the full scale I.Q. approach.

Non-Mentally Retarded (N-MR) in Three S.E.S. Groups

The psychometric plualistic approaches did not differ in the number of middle S.E.S. students who were not classified mentally retarded (N=3;50% for both). Again, the limited sample size of Black students prevents interpretation of that data. A large difference occurs

between the psychometric approach and the pluralistic approach in not classifying low S.E.S. students as mentally retarded. The pychometric approach resulted in 10 (25%) of low S.E.S. being termed N-MR, and the pluralistic approach resulted in 27 (68%) (or approximately three times as many) of low S.E.S. being termed N-MR.

Classification Resulting from Three Approaches for Three Ethnic Groups and Two S.E.S. Groups

Table 4 reflects the changes among the classifications resulting from three approaches and the interaction between ethnicity and S.E.S.

---

Put Table 4 about here

---

Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) in Three Ethnic Groups and Two S.E.S. Groups

Little or no difference among the three approaches is revealed in Table 4 for the EMR classification of middle S.E.S. Anglos, Mexican-Americans, and Blacks. Sample size of the middle S.E.S. students again limits interpretation of the data. In contrast, larger differences do appear among the three approaches in classification of low S.E.S. Mexican-American students as EMR. The full scale I.Q. approach results in 19 (73%) of the 26 low S.E.S. Mexican-American students being classified EMR. The psychometric approach results in 18 (69%) of the low S.E.S. Mexican-American students being classified EMR. The pluralistic approach results in 7 (27%) (or approximately one-third as many) low S.E.S. Mexican-American students being classified EMR. Some differences

among the three approaches are shown in the EMR classification of low S.E.S. Anglos. Of 10 low S.E.S. Anglos, the full scale I.Q. approach results in 9 (90%) being classified EMR. The psychometric and pluralistic approaches result in 5 (50%) and 3 (30%), respectively, of the low S.E.S. Anglos being classified EMR. Again, due to the small number of Black students in these categrories, no conclusions are drawn.

Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR) in Three Ethnic Groups and Two S.E.S. Groups

Very few middle S.E.S. students of any ethnic group were classified TMR. In contrast, inspection of the classification of low S.E.S. Mexican-Americans as TMR reveals that the full scale I.Q. approach classified 7 (27%) of these students TMR. The psychometric and the pluralistic approaches both classified 3 (12%) of the low S.E.S. Mexican-American students TMR. Little difference appears among the three approaches for the low S.E.S. Anglo or Black in this category.

Non-Mentally Retarded in Three Ethnic Groups and Two S.E.S. Groups

No differences are revealed among the three approaches in the number of middle S.E.S. Anglos, Mexican-Americans, and Blacks in the sample not classified as mentally retarded (N-MR). However, inspection of the low S.E.S. N-MR categories for Mexican-American students reveals differences. The psychometric approach showed 5 (19%) of the 26 low S.E.S. Mexican-Americans to be N-MR, whereas the pluralistic approach showed more than three times as many (N=16; 62%) of the low S.E.S. Mexican-Americans to be N-MR. Again the limited number of Blacks in the study limits any interpretation of data in several categories. In the low S.E.S. N-MR category, differences exist for the Anglo group.

The psychometric approach showed 4 (40%) of the low S.E.S. Anglos to be N-MR; whereas, the ABIC showed 7(70%) or approximately twice as many to be N-MR. (The small number of low S.E.S Anglos may have contributed to a spuriously high percentage.)

## DISCUSSION

Several trends in the data suggest that sizeable differences in the number of students classified as EMR, or shown to be not retarded, result from the three approaches to classification (full scale I.Q. psychometric, pluralistic) utilized in this study. Overall, the pluralistic approach classifies the fewest students as mentally retarded. In comparison, the psychometric approach typically classified twice as many students as mentally retarded as did the pluralistic approach. The full scale I.Q. approach typically classified three times as many students mentally retarded when compared to the pluralistic approach. The greatest differences among the three approaches occur at the EMR level of classification. At the TMR level, the psychometric and pluralistic approaches result in the classification of similar numbers of students. These findings are in accordance with previous research (Mercer, 1973).

Racial-ethnic differences in classification by the three approaches is apparent. Based on the sample used in the present study, the pluralistic approach appears to have the greatest impact on the classification of Mexican-American students. The pluralistic approach led to about one-half the number of Mexican-American students being classified EMR as compared to the full scale I.Q. and psychometric approaches. At the TMR level of classification, smaller differences occur between the pluralistic and full scale I.Q. approaches, and no

differences occur between the pluralistic and psychometric approaches for Mexican-Americans. A similar trend for Anglo students is noted. Again, the pluralistic approach classifies the fewest Anglos as mentally retarded. Additionally, use of the pluralistic approach results in a larger number of students being termed not retarded. The few number of Blacks in this study prevents any interpretation of data related to that racial-ethnic group. These results are in accord with Mercer's (1973) findings. Mercer reports 60% and 90% shrinkage in the classification of Mexican-American and Blacks, using I.Q. of 69 or less and a 3% cut-off on adaptive behavior (1973, p. 189). Including the ABIC in the traditional classification of mental retardation significantly decreased the number of students, especially minority members, labeled retarded. Based on these findings, various authors (Gerry, 1973; Mercer, 1973, 1974) suggest that a pluralistic evaluation is a must for children. The data in this study supports the contention that a pluralistic approach is needed in the classification of students, expecially minority students.

S.E.S. differences are reflected among the classifications resulting from the three approaches. Further, S.E.S. differences within racial-ethnic groups are indicated. The pluralistic approach classifies approximately one-third the number of low S.E.S. students at the EMR level as compared to the full scale and psychometric approaches. A similar trend (yet smaller differences) occurs at the TMR level of classification for low S.E.S. students. The pluralistic approach fails to classify almost three times as many low S.E.S. students retarded as does the psychometric approach. Mercer reports a 50% shrinkage in

classification of retardation related to S.E.S. (1973, p. 191). The limited number of students in the middle S.E.S. category prevents any interpretation of that data. However, an under-representation of middle to high S.E.S. students classified as MR is reflected in other studies (Mercer, 1974).

The trend for the fewest number of students to be classified mentally retarded by the pluralistic approach is also reflected in the data on S.E.S. within racial-ethnic groups. The major differences in classification occur at the EMR level in the low S.E.S. Mexican-American category. Again, the pluralistic approach leads to approximately one-third of the number of students being classified EMR as compared to the other two methods. Similar trends exist in the low S.E.S. Anglo category at the EMR level of classification and at the TMR level for low S.E.S. Mexican-Americans. The pluralistic approach appears to have a significant impact on the number of low S.E.S. minority students classified as retarded and non-retarded. Again, the data supports the need for a pluralistic assessment of low S.E.S. students (regardless of racial-ethnic group membership). The greatest impact appears to be in the low S.E.S. Mexican-American sub-group of the sample utilized in the present study.[6] The S.E.S. differences reported in this study are consistent with Mercer's earlier work (1973). The over-representation of low S.E.S. students in MR classifications has been reported for several years (Mercer, 1971, 1975; Oakland, 1973). For example, Mercer noted that Mexican-Americans composed 9.5% of the Riverside community; yet, the Mexican-Americans constituted 45% of the public schools' special education program (Mercer, 1975, p. 488).

These results suggest several points regarding how decisions are made in classifying students, especially low S.E.S. minority students, as mentally retarded. The addition of the ABIC to more traditional psychometric batteries appears to result in fewer low S.E.S. minority members being classified as mentally retarded. Hence, the addition of the ABIC is one step toward decreasing what appears to be an over-representation of low S.E.S. minority members in special education classes for the mentally retarded (Oakland, 1973, Mercer, 1976a, 1977b). Additionally, inclusion of the ABIC in the appraisal of educationally handicapped students seems to provide school systems with at least one answer to the current press for non-discriminatory testing and due process in assessment systems (Public law 94-142, Law and Behavior, 1976).

Consideration should be given to additional classification decisions resulting from, at least in part, a pluralistic assessment involving an adaptive bheavior evaluation. A sizeable number of low S.E.S. students (68% in the present study) and/or minority students (57% Mexican-American and 100% Black in the present study) may not be classified as mentally retarded due to non-retarded functioning in adaptive behavior. Similarily, a sizeable number of low S.E.S. and/or minority students currently receiving special education services may be declassified as not mentally retarded due to non-retarded functioning in adaptive behavior.

These students having non-retarded performance in adaptive behavior and retarded academic functioning may not "fit" any existing traditional classification system (as exists in Texas). Typically, students who do not fit or meet any classification or eligibility cri-

teria do not receive special instructional services. Not providing special instructional services to students who are retarded in terms of academically-related skills (but who function adequately in adaptive behavior) would seem to be contrary to the current educational trends and legal guidelines which require that each student receive the most appropriate instructional arrangement. Further, not serving the academically-retarded student in special instructional arrangement, yet providing services to students who have moderate educational disabilities and who function non-retarded in both academic skills and adaptive behavior (e.g., LD, LLD, MBI, students) appears inconsistent with the continuum approach to educational handicaps (a continuum ranging from moderate to severely educationally handicapped). The continuum approach to educational handicaps requires that the more severely educationally handicapped should be provided services before rendering services to the more moderately handicapped. The pluralistic evaluation seems to identify a group of students who may not be on the present continuum for services. Thus, the press for a pluralistic assessment in place of a traditional psychometric assessment may necessarily also be a press for revision of the traditional classification system. Such a revised system, categorical or non-categorical, would hopefully lead to special instructional services for students who function in the retarded range academically but adequately in adaptive behavior.

While the present study suggests several points for consideration, additional data on the impact of the use of the ABIC (and other adaptive behavior instruments) on special education students is needed. Particular emphasis should be placed on gathering data from a sufficient number of middle and high S.E.S. students and members of racial-ethnic groups

in addition to Mexican-Americans. Additional Data in these areas should enable educators, psychologists and other professionals to make improved assessment-related decisions.

CONTENT NOTES

[1]The ethnic composition of the district is 54% Anglo, 41% Mexican-American, and 5% Black.

[2]The district's appraisal procedures require students who appear to have a history of severe retardation to be evaluated with the Stanford-Binet and the AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale. These students were not included in the present study as this study deals with the impact of the ABIC (Mercer, 1973) on special education students. (The results of the Stanford-Binet and the AAMD indicate severely retarded for all 73 students).

[3]Students are evaluated in their primary home language as defined by the Texas Education Agency.

[4]In addition to these criteria, a medical assessment including vision and hearing evaluations is required.

[5]Given that all students included in this study had an I.Q. of 70 or below, no student could be classified as non-mentally retarded by the full scale I.Q. approach.

[6]One of the major findings reported by the Corpus Christi I.S.D. Pluralistic Diagnostic Research Project Team is that based on a normative group of 420 students the Corpus Christi low S.E.S. Mexican-American differs from the Black and Anglo middle and low S.E.S. groups in the community and differs from the California normative sample.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF CLASSIFICATION
OF MENTAL RETARDATION RESULTING
FROM THREE APPROACHES

| | EMR | TMR | Not M-R | Total M-R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I.Q. | | | | |
| N[a] | 34 | 12 | 0 | 46 |
| Percent | (74%) | (26%) | - | (100%) |
| Psychometric | | | | |
| N[a] | 28 | 6 | 12 | 34 |
| Percent | (60%) | (13%) | (26%) | (73%) |
| Pluralistic | | | | |
| N[a] | 12 | 4 | 30 | 16 |
| Percent | (26%) | (8%) | (65%) | (34%) |

[a] Total N=46

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF CLASSIFICATION OF MENTAL RETARDATION RESULTING FROM THREE APPROACHES FOR A TRIETHNIC POPULATION

| | EMR A[a] | EMR M-A[b] | EMR BL.[c] | TMR A | TMR M-A | TMR BL. | Not MR A | Not MR M-A | Not MR BL. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I.Q. | | | | | | | | | |
| N | 10 | 21 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 1 | -- | -- | -- |
| Percent | (83%) | (70%) | (75%)[d] | (17%) | (30%) | (25%) | -- | -- | -- |
| Psychometric | | | | | | | | | |
| N | 6 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 1 |
| Percent | (50%) | (63%) | (50%) | (8%) | (13%) | (25%) | (42%) | (23%) | (25%) |
| Pluralistic | | | | | | | | | |
| N | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 4 |
| Percent | (25%) | (30%) | (0%) | (0%) | (13%) | (0%) | (75%) | (57%) | (100%) |

[a] Anglo Total N=12

[b] Mexican-American Total N=30

[c] Black Total N=4

[d] Caution should be exercised in interpreting percentages calculated on the Black sample due to small N.

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF CLASSIFICATION OF MENTAL RETARDATION RESULTING FROM THREE APPROACHES FOR TWO SES GROUPS

| | EMR Middle[a] | EMR Low[b] | TMR Middle | TMR Low | NOT MR Middle | NOT MR Low |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IQ. | | | | | | |
| N | 3[c] | 31 | 2 | 10 | -- | -- |
| Percent | (50%) | (78%) | (33%) | (25%) | -- | -- |
| Psychometric | | | | | | |
| N | 2 | 25 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
| Percent | (33%) | (63%) | (17%) | (13%) | (50%) | (25%) |
| Pluralistic | | | | | | |
| N | 2 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 27 |
| Percent | (33%) | (25%) | (17%) | (8%) | (50%) | (68%) |

[a]Middle SES Total N=6

[b]Low SES Total N=40

[c]Caution should be exercised in interpreting percentages calculated on the middle SES sample due to the small N.

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF CLASSIFICATION
OF MENTAL RETARDATION RESULTING FROM THREE
APPROACHES FOR THREE ETHNIC GROUPS AND TWO S E S GROUPS

| | EMR Middle A[a] | EMR Middle MA[b] | EMR Middle Bl[c] | EMR Low A[d] | EMR Low MA[e] | EMR Low Bl[f] | TMR Middle A | TMR Middle MA | TMR Middle BL | TMR Low A | TMR Low MA | TMR Low Bl | M-MR Middle A | M-MR Middle MA | M-MR Middle Bl | M-MR Low A | M-MR Low MA | L-MR Low Bl |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I.Q. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N | 1 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Percents[g] | -- | -- | -- | (90%) | (73%) | (75%) | -- | -- | -- | (20%) | (27%) | (25%) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Psychometric | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Percents | -- | -- | -- | (50%) | (69%) | (50%) | -- | -- | -- | (10%) | (12%) | (25%) | -- | -- | -- | (40%) | (19%) | (25%) |
| Pluralistic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 4 |
| Percents | -- | -- | -- | (30%) | (27%) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | (12%) | -- | -- | -- | -- | (70%) | (62%) | (100%) |

[a]Middle SES Anglo Students N=2

[b]Middle SES Mexican-American Students N=4

[c]Middle SES Black Students N=0

[d]Low SES Anglo Students N=10

[e]Low SES Mexican-American Students N=26

[f]Low SES Black Students N=4

[g]Due to the small N for middle SES X ethnicity, no percentages were calculated for these categories.

Reference

American Association on Mental Deficiency. Adaptive behavior scale. Washington, D.C.: 1969.

Bender, L. Bender motor gestalt test: Cards and manual of instructions. The American Orthopsychiatric Association, Inc., 1946.

California State Legislature. Senate Bill No. 33. Februray 25, 1971.

Doll, E. Vineland social maturity scale. Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Services, Inc., 1965.

Dunn, L. or Markuardt, F. Peabody individual achievement test. Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Services, Inc., 1970.

Gerry, M. H. Cultural myopia: The need for a corrective lens. In Phillips, B. N. (Ed.). Assessing Minority Group Children. New York: Behavior Publications, 1973.

Heber, R. F. A manual on terminology and classification in mental retardation. American Journal of Mental Deficiency Monograph Supplement, 1961, 64 (second edition).

Horton, L. The historical development of the concept of adaptive behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of The Kansas Psychiatric Association. Wichita, Kansas, May, 1966.

Jastak, J. and Jastak, S. The wide range achievement test. Wilmington, Delaware: Guidance Associates of Delaware, Inc., 1965.

Mercer, J. R. Sociocultural factors in labeling mental retardates. Peabody Journal of Education, April 1971, 48, 188-203.

Mercer, J. Labeling the mentally retarded. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Mercer, J. A policy statement on assessment procedures and the rights of children. Harvard Educational Review, February, 1974, 44 (1), 125-141.

Mercer, J. Mental retardation as a social problem. In Hobbs, N. (Ed.) Issues in the Classification of Children. (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Tossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Mercer, J. System of multicultural pluralistic assessment: Technical manual. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1977.

Oakland, T. Assessing minority group children: challenges for school psychologists. In Phillips, B. N. (Ed.) Assessing minority group children. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973.

Project on Law and Behavior. Law and Behavior, Spring. 1976, 1 (2).

Project on Law and Behavior. Law and Behavior, Fall. 1976, 4.

Terman, L. and Merrill, M. Stanford-Binet intelligence scale. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960.

Wechsler, D. Wechsler intelligence scale for children. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1949.